

# **North Dakota Assessment Sales Ratio Study 2003**



**Office of State Tax Commissioner  
Rick Clayburgh  
Tax Commissioner**

## **2003 North Dakota Assessment Sales Ratio Study**

### ***Introduction***

The 2003 Assessment Sales Ratio Study (ASRS) has been conducted according to the provisions of North Dakota Century Code §§ 57-01-05 through 57-01-07 by the Property Tax Division of the Office of State Tax Commissioner, under the supervision of the State Supervisor of Assessments. The study is prepared to assist local assessment officials, and to recommend to the Tax Commissioner changes to be made by the State Board of Equalization in the performance of their equalization duties. This report is a synopsis of the comprehensive study. Property tax administrators, local assessing officials, and interested taxpayers utilize this information in examining the assessment levels and the uniformity of assessments throughout North Dakota.

The Study puts major emphasis on sales of improved properties in the residential and commercial categories, because the statutes require the use of market values by the local assessment officials and State Board of Equalization in the assessment and equalization of these two classes of property. Data from each of the 53 counties and 13 largest cities in North Dakota are included in the ASRS and this report.

The 2003 study includes data on sales of property occurring between January 1 and December 31, 2002. A minimum sample size of 30 sales each for residential and commercial property was required, or 10 percent of the total number of properties in each class. If the number of sales that occurred during 2002 did not meet the minimum sample size, sales of property from the prior years of 1999, 2000 and 2001, or current year appraisals, were used to supplement the sales data. The county directors of tax equalization or full-time city assessors provided the property appraisal data to the Property Tax Division. A minimum sample size was not established for the categories of agricultural, lakeshore, mobile homes, or vacant lot properties.

This report includes 11,283 observations used in the 2003 ASRS. In all cases, the base used to measure the relationship between the assessment and the sale price or appraisal value was the finalized 2002 assessment.

### ***Statistical Report***

This report has eight basic tables of statistical data. Table 1 provides an alphabetical listing of the 53 counties and 13 largest cities, showing the price and value figures and accompanying statistical data used for developing measures for interpreting and understanding the ASRS. The data has been stratified into the property categories of agricultural, commercial, vacant lots, residential, lakeshore, and mobile homes.

Table 2 contains a frequency distribution chart, which groups the individual ratios at intervals of five percentage points, starting with those under 45 percent and continuing to those over 140 percent. The distribution chart includes a breakdown of township and urban sales for each county and major city.

Table 3 shows the number and characteristics of the observations in each sample for the residential and commercial categories. Sales include transactions that occurred during 2002. The supplemental observation includes sales of improved residential and commercial properties for the years 1999, 2000 and 2001, and appraisals when required to obtain a sufficient sample size.

Tables 4 and 5 show the median ratios and coefficients of dispersion for the current and four prior years for residential property and commercial property. These tables provide a convenient comparison of data among various counties and cities and categories of property for five years.

## **2003 North Dakota Assessment Sales Ratio Study**

Tables 6 and 7 show the median ratios, adjustment worksheet percentages, the indicated changes and the changes by the State Board of Equalization. The counties that have an asterisk are the counties that were out of tolerance. At the bottom of each page is an explanation of what changes, if any, the state board made in those counties.

Table 8 shows the median ratio and the average price per acre paid for agricultural land, and the number of agricultural sales in the ASRS for each county.

The statistical data in Table 1 include the following measures: (1) arithmetic mean ratio, (2) aggregate mean ratio, (3) median ratio, (4) price-related differential, and (5) coefficient of dispersion. The arithmetic mean, aggregate mean, and median are measures of the central tendency. They indicate the prevailing level of assessment of the universe of properties used in the study. Each of these measures has advantages and limitations.

The arithmetic mean is developed by first computing a ratio for each observation in a stratum, and then dividing the sum of the individual ratios by the number of observations. This measure is sometimes referred to as the simple mathematical average. It is the most easily understood measure of central tendency, but it is greatly distorted by extreme ratios and therefore may not be typical.

The aggregate mean is a second measure of the central tendency and is calculated by dividing the total assessed values for all the observations by the total sale prices of those properties. It is commonly referred to as a weighted average and is greatly influenced by the properties with the greatest value, and therefore may not be typical.

The median is the third measure of the central tendency. It is found by arranging the individual ratios in order of magnitude, then selecting the middle ratio in the series. The median is affected by the number of observations and is not distorted by the size of the extreme ratios. While other statistical measures are considered, the State Board of Equalization currently uses the median ratio when equalizing residential and commercial property assessments.

The price-related differential (PRD), also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the aggregate mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over assessed or under assessed in relation to low-value properties. When the PRD is 1.00, there is no bias in the assessments of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. When the PRD is greater than 1.00 the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 1.00 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties. The *Standard on Ratio Studies*, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, July 1990, recommends that the PRD should lie between .98 and 1.03.

The coefficient of dispersion (COD) measures how closely the individual ratios are arrayed around the median ratio and shows the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy that has been attained in the assessments. This is sometimes referred to as the index of assessment inequality. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. This shows how far the middle cluster of ratios is from the median or how far one must deviate from the median ratio (above or below) to encompass the middle cluster of ratios. For example, a .20 dispersion means that the middle cluster of ratios falls within 20

## **2003 North Dakota Assessment Sales Ratio Study**

percent of the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property, because individual properties are assessed at the same ratio. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios and a large spread in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in taxes. Tax administrators feel that when dispersions occur between .10 and .20 the quality of assessments is acceptable, but any dispersion over .20 indicates the assessments need attention.

### ***Sales Ratio Statistics***

The following example shows the calculations used for developing the five listed measures:

	<u>Finalized Sale Price</u>	<u>T &amp; F Value</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Array</u>	<u>Deviation From Median</u>
1.	\$ 42,000	\$ 36,500	87.9%	99.0	5.9
2.	83,500	81,000	97.0	98.7	5.6
3.	65,000	57,900	89.1	97.0	3.9
4.	79,000	78,200	99.0	96.2	3.1
5.	37,000	32,900	88.9	93.7	.6
6.	87,000	81,500	93.7	92.4	.7
7.	54,000	49,900	92.4	90.9	2.2
8.	81,900	80,800	98.7	89.1	4.0
9.	46,000	41,800	90.9	88.9	4.2
10.	<u>58,300</u>	<u>56,100</u>	<u>96.2</u>	86.9	<u>6.2</u>
	\$633,700	\$596,600	932.8		36.4

Arithmetic Mean Ratio =  $932.8 \div 10 = 93.28$   
Aggregate Mean Ratio =  $\$596,600 \div \$633,700 = 94.1$   
Median = Middle Ratio =  $93.7 + 92.4 = 186.1 \div 2 = 93.05$  or 93.1  
Price Related Differential =  $93.28 \div 94.1 = .99$   
Average Deviation =  $36.4 \div 10 = 3.64$   
Coefficient of Dispersion =  $3.64 \div 93.1 = .039$  or .04

**Table 1**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Adams County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	15	1,234,850	860,994	75.2	69.7	69.5	1.1	0.24
Commercial	33	1,602,450	1,710,524	117.4	106.7	100.1	1.1	0.17
Vacant Lots	4	7,500	6,994	135.3	93.3	138.5	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	37	1,609,950	1,717,518	119.4	106.7	100.1	1.1	0.22
Residential	37	1,384,665	1,234,757	143.4	89.2	97.6	1.6	0.63
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	37	1,384,665	1,234,757	143.4	89.2	97.6	1.6	0.63
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	89	4,229,465	3,813,269	121.9	90.2	100.0	1.4	0.39

<b>Barnes County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	24	2,380,822	1,876,100	88.1	78.8	80.6	1.1	0.23
Commercial	30	991,460	959,000	187.0	96.7	100.0	1.9	1.11
Vacant Lots	15	215,300	111,400	93.9	51.7	50.0	1.8	1.23
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	45	1,206,760	1,070,400	156.0	88.7	96.0	1.8	1.07
Residential	54	2,142,450	1,857,800	88.3	76.7	90.1	1.0	0.28
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	54	2,142,450	1,857,800	88.3	86.7	90.1	1.0	0.28
Mobile Homes	16	123,300	108,607	157.0	88.1	107.2	1.8	0.80
Total County	139	5,853,332	4,912,907	118.1	83.9	90.8	1.4	0.62

<b>City of Valley City</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	31	3,753,500	3,648,950	99.0	97.2	96.6	1.0	0.05
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	31	3,753,500	3,648,950	99.0	97.2	96.6	1.0	0.05
Residential	71	4,426,885	4,344,500	99.1	98.1	97.7	1.0	0.07
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	71	4,426,885	4,344,500	99.1	98.1	97.7	1.0	0.07
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	102	8,180,385	7,993,450	99.1	97.7	96.9	1.0	0.06

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Benson County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	23	2,051,133	2,021,155	97.4	98.5	97.7	1.0	0.21
Commercial	28	1,263,300	1,198,866	119.1	94.9	100.0	1.3	0.25
Vacant Lots	2	4,000	2,308	71.8	57.7	71.8	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	30	1,267,300	1,201,174	116.0	94.8	100.0	1.2	0.25
Residential	40	965,600	847,664	108.4	87.8	95.2	1.2	0.30
Lakeshore	3	110,000	56,780	75.8	51.6	89.8	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	43	1,075,600	904,444	106.1	84.1	93.8	1.3	0.30
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>4,394,033</b>	<b>4,126,773</b>	<b>107.1</b>	<b>93.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.26</b>

<b>Billings County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	9	710,877	409,458	56.7	57.6	57.7	1.0	0.13
Commercial	7	351,000	343,200	96.6	97.8	100.0	0.0	0.00
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	7	351,000	343,200	96.6	97.8	100.0	0.0	0.00
Residential	16	764,700	706,500	94.2	92.4	100.0	1.0	0.06
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	16	764,700	706,500	94.3	92.4	100.0	1.0	0.06
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1,826,577</b>	<b>1,459,158</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>79.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.16</b>

<b>Bottineau County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	23	2,011,850	1,394,400	73.0	69.3	64.6	1.1	0.32
Commercial	30	1,904,474	1,878,090	103.1	98.6	99.9	1.1	0.22
Vacant Lots	6	35,200	11,718	56.3	33.3	24.5	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	36	1,939,674	1,889,808	95.3	97.4	97.1	1.0	0.30
Residential	51	2,161,855	1,849,484	102.4	85.6	91.1	1.2	0.32
Lakeshore	26	1,793,420	567,861	30.0	31.7	26.5	1.0	0.42
Total Res. & Lakeshore	77	3,955,275	2,417,345	77.9	61.1	77.7	1.3	0.48
Mobile Homes	4	34,000	23,313	69.5	68.6	65.8	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>7,940,799</b>	<b>5,724,866</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>79.8</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.42</b>

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Bowman County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	19	1,503,000	1,392,800	104.1	92.7	97.8	1.1	0.17
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	19	1,503,000	1,392,800	104.1	92.7	97.8	1.1	0.17
Residential	30	1,378,150	1,343,100	109.1	97.5	100.1	1.1	0.27
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	30	1,378,150	1,343,100	109.1	97.5	100.1	1.1	0.27
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	49	2,881,150	2,735,900	107.2	95.0	97.8	1.1	0.24

<b>Burke County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	17	1,096,263	811,284	76.1	74.0	77.3	1.0	0.15
Commercial	31	2,169,139	2,170,774	100.3	100.1	100.0	1.0	0.00
Vacant Lots	1	300	310	103.3	103.3	103.3	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	32	2,169,439	2,171,084	100.4	100.1	100.0	1.0	0.00
Residential	34	689,314	692,178	156.7	100.4	101.6	1.6	0.61
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	34	689,314	692,178	156.7	100.4	101.6	1.6	0.61
Mobile Homes	1	40,000	38,900	97.3	97.3	97.3	0.0	0.00
Total County	84	3,995,016	3,713,446	118.2	93.0	100.0	1.3	0.30

<b>Burleigh County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	14	852,760	563,656	69.8	66.1	59.0	1.1	0.29
Commercial	14	1,824,700	1,755,400	96.1	96.2	97.8	1.0	0.03
Vacant Lots	17	516,300	477,650	96.2	92.5	95.7	1.0	0.06
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	31	2,341,000	2,233,050	96.1	95.4	97.5	1.0	0.05
Residential	78	9,937,724	9,425,644	95.9	94.8	94.6	1.0	0.06
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	78	9,937,724	9,425,644	95.9	94.8	94.6	1.0	0.06
Mobile Homes	79	2,025,111	1,934,180	95.8	95.5	96.3	1.0	0.11
Total County	202	15,156,595	14,156,530	94.1	93.4	94.6	1.0	0.10

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>City of Bismarck</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	34	9,582,893	9,607,500	95.0	100.3	94.3	1.0	0.07
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	34	9,582,893	9,607,500	95.0	100.3	94.3	1.0	0.07
Residential	695	75,970,370	70,745,400	93.3	93.1	93.7	1.0	0.05
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	695	75,970,370	70,745,400	93.3	93.1	93.7	1.0	0.05
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	729	85,553,263	80,352,900	93.4	93.9	93.7	1.0	0.06

<b>Cass County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	29	4,372,223	2,662,000	61.8	60.9	63.4	1.0	0.17
Commercial	39	2,930,334	2,729,200	104.3	93.1	101.0	1.1	0.27
Vacant Lots	55	1,743,466	846,000	61.5	48.5	50.3	1.3	0.46
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	94	4,673,800	3,575,200	79.3	76.5	71.6	1.0	0.47
Residential	233	25,728,742	22,513,300	90.8	87.5	89.3	1.0	0.18
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	233	25,728,742	22,513,300	90.8	87.5	89.3	1.0	0.18
Mobile Homes	54	1,084,302	1,063,741	115.7	98.1	98.6	1.2	0.35
Total County	410	35,859,067	29,814,241	89.4	83.1	87.1	1.1	0.28

<b>City of Fargo</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	51	17,436,000	17,533,700	97.5	100.6	93.4	1.0	0.17
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	51	17,436,000	17,533,700	97.5	100.6	93.4	1.0	0.17
Residential	1,251	150,693,740	138,918,700	92.4	92.2	92.4	1.0	0.10
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	1,251	150,693,740	138,918,700	92.4	92.2	92.4	1.0	0.10
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	1,302	168,129,740	156,452,400	92.6	93.1	92.4	1.0	0.10

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>City of West Fargo</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	40	10,968,746	10,313,200	97.4	94.0	97.5	1.0	0.11
Vacant Lots	85	3,540,987	1,864,600	53.3	52.7	46.9	1.0	0.24
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	125	14,509,733	12,177,800	67.4	83.9	57.8	0.8	0.39
Residential	272	29,654,368	27,652,500	93.7	93.2	94.0	1.0	0.08
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	272	29,654,368	27,652,500	93.7	93.2	94.0	1.0	0.08
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	397	44,164,101	39,830,300	85.4	90.2	91.1	1.0	0.16

<b>Cavalier County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	44	5,624,391	3,423,702	62.6	60.9	62.5	1.0	0.18
Commercial	30	1,711,695	1,699,200	100.3	99.3	98.7	1.0	0.11
Vacant Lots	4	4,650	7,520	351.9	161.7	257.1	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	34	1,716,345	1,706,720	129.9	99.4	100.3	1.3	0.42
Residential	48	2,301,419	2,279,724	100.5	99.1	100.1	1.0	0.18
Lakeshore	1	6,500	2,778	42.7	42.7	42.7	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	49	2,307,919	2,282,502	99.4	98.9	98.8	1.0	0.19
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	127	9,648,655	7,412,924	94.8	76.8	88.5	1.2	0.34

<b>Dickey County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	20	1,369,797	1,087,569	86.3	79.4	81	1.1	0.18
Commercial	30	1,855,600	1,768,463	97.2	95.3	95.9	1.0	0.14
Vacant Lots	6	54,030	32,625	57.1	60.4	59.5	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	36	1,909,630	1,801,088	90.5	94.3	94.2	1.0	0.18
Residential	51	2,025,010	1,846,018	145.8	91.2	97.5	1.6	0.65
Lakeshore	2	40,000	50,221	132.4	125.6	132.4	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	53	2,065,010	1,896,239	145.3	91.8	98.4	1.6	0.63
Mobile Homes	1	11,000	9,234	83.9	83.9	83.9	0.0	0.00
Total County	110	5,355,437	4,794,130	116.1	89.5	93.6	1.3	0.42

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Divide County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	20	1,419,530	1,009,000	75.5	71.1	75	1.1	0.15
Commercial	10	260,050	275,800	102.9	106.1	104.5	1.0	0.28
Vacant Lots	2	16,000	17,300	101.6	108.1	101.6	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	12	276,050	293,100	102.7	106.2	103.1	1.0	0.26
Residential	30	798,900	724,700	111.0	90.7	107.0	1.2	0.34
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	30	798,900	724,700	111.0	90.7	107.0	1.2	0.34
Mobile Homes	1	10,500	12,200	116.2	116.2	116.2	0.0	0.00
Total County	63	2,504,980	2,039,000	98.2	81.4	88.0	1.2	0.34

<b>Dunn County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	17	2,528,953	1,295,400	56.8	51.2	54.2	1.1	0.23
Commercial	14	676,500	688,126	100.5	101.7	101.6	1.0	0.04
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	14	676,500	688,126	100.5	101.7	101.6	1.0	0.04
Residential	32	957,920	936,466	101.9	97.8	97.2	1.0	0.12
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	32	957,920	936,466	101.9	97.8	97.2	1.0	0.12
Mobile Homes	1	4,500	7,100	157.8	157.8	157.8	0.0	0.00
Total County	64	4,167,873	2,927,092	90.5	70.2	97.0	1.3	0.19

<b>Eddy County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	11	854,429	768,160	100.9	89.9	96.6	1.1	0.26
Commercial	9	417,000	404,000	97.6	96.9	100.0	1.0	0.08
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	9	417,000	404,000	97.6	96.9	100.0	1.0	0.08
Residential	38	883,871	857,000	108.1	97.0	100.8	1.1	0.20
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	38	883,871	857,000	108.1	97.0	100.8	1.1	0.20
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	58	2,155,300	2,029,160	105.1	94.1	100.0	1.1	0.19

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Emmons County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	40	5,054,016	3,057,476	67.3	60.5	66.0	1.1	0.23
Commercial	27	1,327,500	1,345,780	110.3	101.4	100.0	1.1	0.23
Vacant Lots	3	7,750	10,600	206.3	136.8	138.9	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	30	1,335,250	1,356,380	119.9	101.6	101.3	1.2	0.32
Residential	30	898,780	1,008,314	148.1	112.2	115.3	1.3	0.49
Lakeshore	2	85,000	72,000	88.6	84.7	88.6	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	32	983,780	1,080,314	144.4	109.8	114.6	1.3	0.48
Mobile Homes	2	26,750	21,500	80.7	80.4	80.7	0.0	0.00
Total County	104	7,399,796	5,515,670	106.4	74.5	89.8	1.4	0.44

<b>Foster County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	10	926,720	781,560	92.5	84.3	84.1	1.1	0.24
Commercial	22	3,296,000	3,073,100	102.7	93.2	100.0	1.1	0.14
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	22	3,296,000	3,073,100	102.7	93.2	100.0	1.1	0.14
Residential	47	2,907,258	2,778,400	101.8	95.6	98.3	1.1	0.15
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	47	2,907,258	2,778,400	101.8	95.6	98.3	1.1	0.15
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	79	7,129,978	6,633,060	100.9	93.0	98.0	1.1	0.16

<b>Golden Valley County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	17	2,451,766	1,366,600	66.0	55.7	65.9	1.2	0.25
Commercial	9	441,500	442,860	100.6	100.3	100.0	1.0	0.13
Vacant Lots	3	7,500	7,600	117.0	101.3	90.9	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	12	449,000	450,460	104.7	100.3	98.1	1.0	0.26
Residential	37	1,362,910	1,086,580	113.5	79.7	91.0	1.4	0.53
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	37	1,362,910	1,086,580	113.5	79.7	91.0	1.4	0.53
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	66	4,263,676	2,903,640	99.7	68.1	85.3	1.5	0.45

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Grand Forks County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	21	2,210,423	2,107,800	107.5	95.4	102.7	1.1	0.31
Commercial	30	15,236,889	14,844,119	117.0	97.4	97.7	1.2	0.49
Vacant Lots	20	185,050	96,290	89.4	52.0	71.9	1.7	0.89
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	50	15,421,939	14,940,409	106.0	96.9	90.5	1.1	0.61
Residential	141	10,761,725	9,508,000	19.8	88.4	91.0	1.2	0.38
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	141	10,761,725	9,508,000	109.8	88.4	91.0	1.2	0.38
Mobile Homes	63	1,156,676	1,145,707	117.6	99.1	100.2	1.2	0.42
Total County	275	29,550,763	27,701,916	110.7	93.7	93.0	1.2	0.43

<b>City of Grand Forks</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	34	11,924,771	11,544,600	95.2	96.8	93.4	1.0	0.12
Vacant Lots	52	4,161,468	2,753,800	125.3	66.2	69.9	1.9	1.08
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	86	16,086,239	14,298,400	113.4	88.9	82.0	1.3	0.64
Residential	607	63,109,070	58,415,900	93.2	92.6	92.8	1.0	0.07
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	607	63,109,070	58,415,900	93.2	92.6	92.8	1.0	0.07
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	693	79,195,309	72,714,300	95.7	91.8	92.2	1.0	0.14

<b>Grant County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	28	2,229,961	1,512,894	73.1	67.8	63.8	1.1	0.27
Commercial	11	216,000	210,598	99.1	97.5	101.0	1.0	0.04
Vacant Lots	1	1,029	1,000	97.2	97.2	97.2	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	12	217,029	211,598	98.9	97.5	100.2	1.0	0.04
Residential	31	571,400	559,741	98.7	98.0	98.7	1.0	0.05
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	31	571,400	559,741	98.7	98.0	98.7	1.0	0.05
Mobile Homes	3	101,000	94,540	93.0	93.6	95.2	0.0	0.00
Total County	74	3,119,390	2,378,773	88.8	76.3	95.6	1.2	0.16

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Griggs County</b>	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	-----Sales Ratio-----			PRD	COD
				Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median		
Agricultural	17	1,288,750	1,181,532	91.4	91.7	97.2	1.0	0.13
Commercial	18	784,928	730,979	100.9	93.1	98.4	1.1	0.11
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	18	784,928	730,979	100.9	93.1	98.4	1.1	0.11
Residential	38	1,650,550	1,571,002	99.2	95.2	97.4	1.0	0.10
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	38	1,650,550	1,571,002	99.2	95.2	97.4	1.0	0.10
Mobile Homes	3	59,252	60,503	101.5	102.1	101.0	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>3,783,480</b>	<b>3,544,016</b>	<b>97.9</b>	<b>93.7</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.10</b>

<b>Hettinger County</b>	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	-----Sales Ratio-----			PRD	COD
				Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median		
Agricultural	18	1,481,855	933,490	63.0	63.0	63.7	1.0	0.19
Commercial	13	383,200	382,370	99.5	99.8	100.0	1.0	0.02
Vacant Lots	2	4,450	2,160	80.3	48.5	80.3	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	15	387,650	384,530	96.9	99.5	100.0	1.0	0.07
Residential	32	812,955	776,810	98.5	95.6	97.3	1.0	0.11
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	32	812,955	776,810	98.5	95.6	97.3	1.0	0.11
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>2,682,460</b>	<b>2,094,830</b>	<b>88.3</b>	<b>78.1</b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.17</b>

<b>Kidder County</b>	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	-----Sales Ratio-----			PRD	COD
				Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median		
Agricultural	13	822,849	704,594	92.2	85.6	101.4	1.1	0.23
Commercial	12	329,200	280,727	100.6	85.3	95.6	1.2	0.32
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	12	329,200	280,727	100.6	85.3	95.6	1.2	0.32
Residential	45	1,158,300	1,054,582	105.5	91.0	97.6	1.2	0.28
Lakeshore	22	546,840	228,086	67.2	41.7	47.0	1.6	0.69
Total Res. & Lakeshore	67	1,705,140	1,282,668	92.9	75.2	95.7	1.2	0.32
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>2,857,189</b>	<b>2,267,989</b>	<b>93.8</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.30</b>

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>LaMoure County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	15	1,660,800	1,207,800	76.0	72.7	77.7	1.1	0.14
Commercial	28	1,162,550	1,200,983	101.7	103.3	101.5	1.0	0.10
Vacant Lots	1	5,500	3,400	61.8	61.8	61.8	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	29	1,168,050	1,204,383	100.3	103.1	101.1	1.0	0.11
Residential	42	1,447,664	1,382,834	103.0	95.5	93.0	1.1	0.23
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	42	1,447,664	1,382,834	103.0	95.5	93.0	1.1	0.23
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	86	4,276,514	3,795,017	97.4	88.7	93.1	1.1	0.19

<b>Logan County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	40	3,377,392	2,393,500	78.8	70.9	68.5	1.1	0.30
Commercial	15	653,261	673,500	104.3	103.1	100.3	1.0	0.08
Vacant Lots	5	13,750	5,300	54.8	38.5	60.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	20	667,011	678,800	91.9	101.8	99.7	0.9	0.17
Residential	47	920,150	868,300	106.5	94.4	100.0	1.1	0.25
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	47	920,150	868,300	106.5	94.4	100.0	1.1	0.25
Mobile Homes	2	25,200	27,600	121.7	109.5	121.7	0.0	0.00
Total County	109	4,989,753	3,968,200	93.9	79.5	93.9	1.2	0.28

<b>McHenry County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	37	2,751,348	2,092,395	83.2	76.0	80.1	1.1	0.29
Commercial	30	576,077	740,057	140.7	128.5	100.0	1.1	0.58
Vacant Lots	9	53,100	47,517	68.6	89.5	76.8	0.8	0.31
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	39	629,177	787,574	124.1	125.2	100.0	1.0	0.52
Residential	41	1,227,674	1,032,055	162.6	84.1	98.8	1.9	0.97
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	41	1,227,674	1,032,055	162.6	84.1	98.8	1.9	0.97
Mobile Homes	3	80,942	74,157	85.2	91.6	92.6	0.0	0.00
Total County	120	4,689,141	3,986,181	123.7	85.0	89.3	1.5	0.65

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>McIntosh County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	68	5,700,208	3,804,541	79.5	66.7	74.7	1.2	0.23
Commercial	23	1,175,089	1,121,777	99.9	95.5	98.0	1.1	0.11
Vacant Lots	2	7,860	2,575	76.7	32.8	76.7	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	25	1,182,949	1,124,352	98.0	95.0	98.0	1.0	0.14
Residential	42	1,578,615	1,499,209	99.3	95.0	96.9	1.1	0.19
Lakeshore	2	9,240	8,000	74.8	86.6	74.8	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	44	1,587,855	1,507,209	98.2	94.9	96.0	1.0	0.19
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>8,471,012</b>	<b>6,436,102</b>	<b>88.9</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>87.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.23</b>

<b>McKenzie County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	15	1,640,938	951,841	60.6	58.0	63.4	1.0	0.21
Commercial	21	1,364,700	1,366,232	100.9	100.1	100.0	1.0	0.07
Vacant Lots	9	27,000	24,280	92.3	89.9	100.0	1.0	0.24
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	30	1,391,700	1,390,512	98.4	99.9	100.0	1.0	0.12
Residential	37	1,516,725	1,465,699	102.5	96.6	98.2	1.1	0.15
Lakeshore	2	18,500	15,720	87.8	85.0	87.8	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	39	1,535,225	1,481,419	101.7	96.5	98.2	1.1	0.15
Mobile Homes	4	69,700	67,560	172.3	96.9	105.8	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>4,637,563</b>	<b>3,891,332</b>	<b>96.8</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>96.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.22</b>

<b>McLean County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	23	1,782,625	1,264,500	75.3	70.9	72.9	1.1	0.18
Commercial	44	1,896,900	1,780,400	133.0	93.9	93.0	1.4	0.74
Vacant Lots	41	441,408	285,400	133.6	64.7	83.3	2.1	0.99
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	85	2,338,308	2,065,800	133.3	88.3	83.3	1.5	0.91
Residential	114	4,570,707	3,995,250	111.3	87.4	90.9	1.3	0.44
Lakeshore	24	1,572,800	834,900	56.5	53.1	52.3	1.1	0.33
Total Res. & Lakeshore	138	6,143,507	4,830,150	101.8	78.6	85.9	1.3	0.45
Mobile Homes	7	81,800	71,869	89.4	87.9	87.8	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>10,346,240</b>	<b>8,232,319</b>	<b>109.6</b>	<b>79.6</b>	<b>84.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.58</b>

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Mercer County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	19	1,670,274	1,246,524	82.8	74.6	75.7	1.1	0.31
Commercial	33	1,825,500	1,795,100	98.3	98.3	97.8	1.0	0.04
Vacant Lots	18	112,275	105,350	102.8	93.8	92.6	1.1	0.34
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	51	1,937,775	1,900,450	99.9	98.1	97.0	1.0	0.15
Residential	105	5,824,527	5,554,728	103.7	95.4	95.8	1.1	0.21
Lakeshore	3	98,000	140,500	117.3	143.4	90.9	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	108	5,922,527	5,695,228	104.0	96.2	95.7	1.1	0.21
Mobile Homes	3	22,000	29,038	125.1	132.0	139.8	0.0	0.00
Total County	181	9,552,576	8,871,240	101.0	92.9	95.6	1.1	0.21

<b>Morton County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	31	3,223,516	2,120,300	71.9	65.8	66.7	1.1	0.36
Commercial	30	1,042,404	1,198,450	157.3	115.0	100.0	1.4	0.79
Vacant Lots	40	643,225	420,400	84.4	65.4	63.2	1.3	0.50
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	70	1,685,629	1,618,850	115.6	96.0	80.0	1.2	0.71
Residential	78	4,122,309	3,548,900	112.1	86.1	92.3	1.3	0.40
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	78	4,122,309	3,548,900	112.1	86.1	92.3	1.3	0.40
Mobile Homes	48	475,464	406,450	110.2	85.5	88.1	1.3	0.51
Total County	227	9,506,918	7,694,500	107.3	80.9	84.0	1.3	0.52

<b>City of Mandan</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	48	9,129,500	8,286,800	88.9	90.8	90.2	1.0	0.15
Vacant Lots	89	3,370,200	786,100	33.4	23.3	36.7	1.4	0.57
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	137	12,499,700	9,072,900	52.9	72.6	55.0	0.7	0.53
Residential	182	18,073,900	16,543,600	93.9	91.5	93.2	1.0	0.09
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	182	18,073,900	16,543,600	93.9	91.5	93.2	1.0	0.09
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	319	30,573,600	25,616,500	76.3	83.8	87.4	0.9	0.26

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Mountrail County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	13	1,247,147	649,100	51.7	52.0	52.3	1.0	0.20
Commercial	30	1,098,100	1,387,900	128.9	126.4	100.0	1.0	0.35
Vacant Lots	4	52,900	20,200	37.8	38.2	38.2	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	34	1,151,000	1,408,100	118.1	122.3	100.0	1.0	0.38
Residential	37	1,387,400	1,163,700	98.9	83.9	85.7	1.2	0.35
Lakeshore	1	14,400	5,000	34.7	34.7	34.7	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	38	1,401,800	1,168,700	97.2	83.4	85.6	1.2	0.35
Mobile Homes	17	183,526	124,738	79.5	68.0	48.5	1.2	0.83
Total County	102	3,983,473	3,350,638	95.4	84.1	88.4	1.1	0.44

<b>Nelson County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	30	2,273,966	2,331,463	114.0	102.5	100.7	1.1	0.32
Commercial	18	410,775	441,470	121.2	107.5	95.9	1.1	0.49
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	18	410,775	441,470	121.2	107.5	95.9	1.1	0.49
Residential	33	743,900	680,773	149.5	91.5	97.7	1.6	0.77
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	33	743,900	680,773	149.5	91.5	97.7	1.6	0.77
Mobile Homes	2	89,503	73,302	98.1	81.9	98.1	0.0	0.00
Total County	83	3,518,144	3,527,008	129.3	100.3	97.7	1.3	0.53

<b>Oliver County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	13	1,109,200	612,318	65.3	55.2	61.3	1.2	0.22
Commercial	3	26,409	26,843	101.1	101.6	98.5	0.0	0.00
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	3	26,409	26,843	101.1	101.6	98.5	0.0	0.00
Residential	33	1,343,505	1,321,415	100.4	98.4	98.8	1.0	0.13
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	33	1,343,505	1,321,415	100.4	98.4	98.8	1.0	0.13
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	49	2,479,114	1,960,576	91.1	79.1	95.4	1.2	0.18

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Pembina County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	32	5,669,200	3,824,694	68.0	67.5	59.5	1.0	0.33
Commercial	30	1,392,950	1,063,693	90.9	76.4	95.7	1.2	0.26
Vacant Lots	4	10,000	16,926	194.2	169.3	137.3	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	34	1,402,950	1,080,619	103.1	77.0	97.2	1.3	0.36
Residential	62	3,073,851	2,835,389	133.4	92.2	100.2	1.5	0.54
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	62	3,073,851	2,835,389	133.4	92.2	100.2	1.5	0.54
Mobile Homes	3	29,000	33,561	102.2	115.7	95.3	0.0	0.00
Total County	131	10,175,001	7,774,263	108.8	76.4	93.6	1.4	0.46

<b>Pierce County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	35	3,491,179	2,899,286	90.7	83.0	81.3	1.1	0.24
Commercial	30	1,571,416	1,576,245	101.9	100.3	101.9	1.0	0.04
Vacant Lots	5	16,250	12,276	111.2	75.5	125.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	35	1,587,666	1,588,521	103.2	100.1	102.2	1.0	0.08
Residential	40	1,732,277	1,512,152	97.1	87.3	92.9	1.1	0.21
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	40	1,732,277	1,512,152	97.1	87.3	92.9	1.1	0.21
Mobile Homes	3	42,400	18,489	63.5	43.6	37.6	0.0	0.00
Total County	113	6,853,522	6,018,448	96.1	87.8	97.0	1.1	0.19

<b>Ramsey County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	26	1,934,254	1,730,434	96.6	89.5	87.5	1.1	0.30
Commercial	25	532,750	522,440	99.5	98.1	100.0	1.0	0.03
Vacant Lots	25	331,100	157,420	49.8	47.5	50.0	1.1	0.49
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	50	863,850	679,860	74.7	78.7	95.0	1.0	0.30
Residential	51	3,426,207	3,068,845	88.1	89.6	95.4	1.0	0.16
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	51	3,426,207	3,068,845	88.1	89.6	95.4	1.0	0.16
Mobile Homes	25	439,395	416,389	135.3	94.8	93.3	1.4	0.59
Total County	152	6,663,706	5,895,528	92.9	88.5	92.9	1.1	0.31

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>City of Devils Lake</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	33	5,888,751	4,603,200	97.8	78.2	95.6	1.3	0.23
Vacant Lots	2	23,250	14,500	67.9	62.4	67.9	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	35	5,912,001	4,617,700	96.1	78.1	91.7	1.2	0.24
Residential	56	2,954,898	2,778,000	101.2	94.0	96.9	1.1	0.18
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	56	2,954,898	2,778,000	101.2	94.0	96.9	1.1	0.18
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	91	8,866,899	7,395,700	99.2	83.4	95.6	1.2	0.20

<b>Ransom County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	11	1,051,000	794,400	86.1	75.6	88.6	1.1	0.21
Commercial	30	4,316,328	4,348,200	100.9	100.7	99.8	1.0	0.03
Vacant Lots	2	3,500	3,200	86.7	91.4	86.7	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	32	4,319,828	4,351,400	100.0	100.7	99.8	1.0	0.05
Residential	47	2,450,143	2,305,300	104.2	94.1	98.0	1.1	0.22
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	47	2,450,143	2,305,300	104.2	94.1	98.0	1.1	0.22
Mobile Homes	2	8,500	12,217	144.2	143.7	144.2	0.0	0.00
Total County	92	7,829,471	7,463,317	101.4	95.3	99.6	1.1	0.16

<b>Renville County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	20	1,816,625	1,228,400	68.0	67.6	66.9	1.0	0.13
Commercial	20	808,557	755,293	108.7	93.4	103.4	1.2	0.32
Vacant Lots	2	23,000	9,200	44.1	40.0	44.1	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	22	831,557	764,493	102.8	91.9	95.9	1.1	0.37
Residential	46	1,272,903	1,170,010	124.6	91.9	96.2	1.4	0.53
Lakeshore	1	22,000	10,150	46.1	46.1	46.1	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	47	1,294,903	1,180,160	122.9	91.1	95.9	1.4	0.53
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	89	3,943,085	3,173,053	105.6	80.5	86.9	1.3	0.47

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Richland County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	21	3,386,215	1,676,100	50.9	49.5	49.8	1.0	0.19
Commercial	30	25,011,621	24,035,300	96.6	96.1	97.4	1.0	0.16
Vacant Lots	6	44,500	43,100	96.8	96.9	97.9	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	36	25,056,121	24,078,400	96.6	96.1	97.4	1.0	0.15
Residential	53	2,570,835	2,415,100	101.2	93.9	95.0	1.1	0.16
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	53	2,570,835	2,415,100	101.2	93.9	95.0	1.1	0.16
Mobile Homes	14	253,028	276,370	111.8	109.2	110.3	1.0	0.13
Total County	124	31,266,199	28,445,970	92.5	91.0	94.0	1.0	0.22

<b>City of Wahpeton</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	30	16,363,283	15,946,420	96.5	97.5	100.0	1.0	0.13
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	30	16,363,283	15,946,420	96.5	97.5	100.0	1.0	0.13
Residential	81	6,385,386	6,452,800	108.6	101.1	98.1	1.1	0.20
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	81	6,385,386	6,452,800	108.6	101.1	98.1	1.1	0.20
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	111	22,748,669	22,399,220	105.3	98.5	100.0	1.1	0.18

<b>Rolette County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	21	971,750	937,868	103.6	96.5	103.8	1.1	0.25
Commercial	29	1,675,621	1,688,963	101.2	100.8	101.2	1.0	0.12
Vacant Lots	2	11,500	2,880	26.1	25.0	26.1	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	31	1,687,121	1,691,843	96.4	100.3	100.2	1.0	0.16
Residential	61	2,110,866	1,934,600	118.7	91.6	98.1	1.3	0.41
Lakeshore	1	3,333	2,790	83.7	83.7	83.7	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	62	2,114,199	1,937,390	118.1	91.6	97.1	1.3	0.41
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	114	4,773,070	4,567,101	109.5	95.7	98.9	1.1	0.31

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Sargent County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	18	1,596,600	1,222,054	74.3	76.5	75.7	1.0	0.17
Commercial	16	487,550	515,696	108.5	105.8	106.1	1.0	0.09
Vacant Lots	9	28,299	14,646	70.5	51.8	69.4	1.4	0.55
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	25	515,849	530,342	94.8	102.8	100.9	0.9	0.26
Residential	31	1,152,389	1,043,217	102.0	90.5	95.7	1.1	0.23
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	31	1,152,389	1,043,217	102.0	90.5	95.7	1.1	0.23
Mobile Homes	5	91,197	125,400	301.1	137.5	125.5	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>3,356,035</b>	<b>2,921,013</b>	<b>106.0</b>	<b>87.0</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.38</b>

<b>Sheridan County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	6	337,280	274,820	85.5	81.5	87.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	5	116,800	117,150	100.3	100.3	99.8	0.0	0.00
Vacant Lots	3	865	847	102.2	97.9	96.2	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	8	117,665	117,997	101.0	100.3	99.6	1.0	0.06
Residential	32	452,350	413,120	170.9	91.3	98.8	1.9	0.89
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	32	452,350	413,120	170.9	91.3	98.8	1.9	0.89
Mobile Homes	1	28,000	27,900	99.6	99.6	99.6	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>935,295</b>	<b>833,837</b>	<b>146.6</b>	<b>89.2</b>	<b>98.9</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.64</b>

<b>Sioux County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	2	566,800	258,018	72.3	45.5	72.3	0.0	0.00
Commercial	5	268,135	231,000	156.6	86.2	108.4	0.0	0.00
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	5	268,135	231,000	156.6	86.2	108.4	0.0	0.00
Residential	30	195,471	160,731	256.5	82.2	100.0	3.1	1.90
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	30	195,471	160,731	256.5	82.2	100.0	3.1	1.90
Mobile Homes	2	18,705	10,672	178.3	57.1	178.3	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1,049,111</b>	<b>660,421</b>	<b>230.2</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>1.66</b>

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Slope County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	14	2,457,960	1,614,242	70.1	65.7	63.8	1.1	0.29
Commercial	5	65,557	53,427	94.2	81.5	100.0	0.0	0.00
Vacant Lots	2	3,500	830	23.3	23.7	23.3	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	7	69,057	54,257	74.0	78.6	90.0	0.0	0.00
Residential	15	147,350	137,338	110.4	93.2	100.0	1.2	0.35
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	15	147,350	137,338	110.4	93.2	100.0	1.2	0.35
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	36	2,674,367	1,805,837	87.6	67.5	82.3	1.3	0.38

<b>Stark County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	16	1,401,995	667,300	48.7	47.6	45.1	1.0	0.24
Commercial	30	2,134,477	2,202,377	128.6	103.2	100.0	1.3	0.32
Vacant Lots	7	28,850	21,441	82.6	74.3	75.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	37	2,163,327	2,223,818	119.9	102.8	100.0	1.2	0.30
Residential	38	2,126,250	2,056,466	101.8	96.7	94.1	1.1	0.12
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	38	2,126,250	2,056,466	101.8	96.7	94.1	1.1	0.12
Mobile Homes	15	109,400	103,926	114.7	95.0	111.1	1.2	0.23
Total County	106	5,800,972	5,051,510	101.9	87.1	98.9	1.2	0.27

<b>City of Dickinson</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	32	5,756,200	5,964,200	98.5	103.6	98.3	1.0	0.12
Vacant Lots	5	114,450	109,800	88.5	95.9	84.6	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	37	5,870,650	6,074,000	97.1	103.5	96.9	0.9	0.12
Residential	167	11,779,024	11,348,300	98.6	96.3	94.9	1.0	0.10
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	167	11,779,024	11,348,300	98.6	96.3	94.9	1.0	0.10
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	204	17,649,674	17,422,300	98.3	98.7	95.3	1.0	0.10

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Steele County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	4	612,000	529,794	86.6	86.6	97.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	16	249,946	258,232	103.1	103.3	98.5	1.0	0.07
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	16	249,946	258,232	103.1	103.3	98.5	1.0	0.07
Residential	34	670,806	635,878	108.1	94.8	93.3	1.1	0.25
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	34	670,806	635,878	108.1	94.8	93.3	1.1	0.25
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total County	54	1,532,752	1,423,904	105.0	92.9	97.5	1.1	0.19

<b>Stutsman County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	30	3,515,159	2,392,800	70.3	68.1	69.9	1.0	0.11
Commercial	30	2,053,450	1,987,100	105.9	96.8	100.0	1.1	0.15
Vacant Lots	3	27,000	18,300	58.4	67.8	69.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	33	2,080,450	2,005,400	101.6	96.4	100.0	1.1	0.17
Residential	40	2,175,450	1,934,100	103.7	88.9	98.3	1.2	0.25
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	40	2,175,450	1,934,100	103.7	88.9	98.3	1.2	0.25
Mobile Homes	29	624,024	616,770	99.2	98.8	94.2	1.0	0.21
Total County	132	8,395,083	6,949,070	94.6	82.8	91.3	1.1	0.24

<b>City of Jamestown</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	35	11,395,450	8,918,300	95.8	78.3	96.3	1.2	0.13
Vacant Lots	17	230,800	144,700	70.2	62.7	60.7	1.1	0.55
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	52	11,626,250	9,063,000	87.4	78.0	93.6	1.1	0.24
Residential	181	13,260,362	12,423,700	98.2	93.7	95.6	1.1	0.16
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	181	13,260,362	12,423,700	98.2	93.7	95.6	1.1	0.16
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	233	24,886,612	21,486,700	95.8	86.3	95.0	1.1	0.18

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Towner County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	26	1,819,332	1,987,852	113.5	109.3	102.0	1.0	0.20
Commercial	30	2,783,100	2,763,414	134.5	99.3	108.4	1.4	0.47
Vacant Lots	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	30	2,783,100	2,763,414	134.5	99.3	108.4	1.4	0.47
Residential	41	1,167,718	1,322,056	191.5	113.2	113.5	1.7	0.85
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	41	1,167,718	1,322,056	191.5	113.2	113.5	1.7	0.85
Mobile Homes	2	29,250	30,173	98.2	103.2	98.2	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>5,799,400</b>	<b>6,103,495</b>	<b>151.9</b>	<b>105.2</b>	<b>108.9</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.56</b>

<b>Traill County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	37	4,881,066	3,629,756	115.2	74.4	68.6	1.6	0.84
Commercial	32	1,769,700	1,583,504	104.6	89.5	100.1	1.2	0.35
Vacant Lots	9	37,839	60,788	189.4	160.6	201.4	1.2	0.33
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	41	1,807,539	1,644,292	123.2	91.0	102.9	1.4	0.46
Residential	105	5,859,394	5,349,238	103.7	91.3	96.1	1.1	0.31
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	105	5,859,394	5,349,238	103.7	91.3	96.1	1.1	0.31
Mobile Homes	1	11,000	11,520	104.7	104.7	104.7	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>12,558,999</b>	<b>10,634,806</b>	<b>110.4</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>94.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.44</b>

<b>Walsh County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	27	3,695,829	2,736,700	86.4	74.0	75.7	1.2	0.34
Commercial	30	2,332,777	2,338,442	102.7	100.2	100.0	1.0	0.16
Vacant Lots	4	12,850	12,100	82.0	94.2	75.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	34	2,345,627	2,350,542	100.2	100.2	100.0	1.0	0.19
Residential	44	1,653,050	1,477,623	116.0	89.4	95.6	1.3	0.41
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	44	1,653,050	1,477,623	116.0	89.4	95.6	1.3	0.41
Mobile Homes	7	92,500	99,982	233.0	108.1	128.6	0.0	0.00
<b>Total County</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>7,787,006</b>	<b>6,664,847</b>	<b>111.4</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>97.8</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.39</b>

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>City of Grafton</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	31	3,267,512	3,664,000	146.0	112.1	102.0	1.3	0.51
Vacant Lots	1	19,000	16,600	87.4	87.4	87.4	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	32	3,286,512	3,680,600	144.2	112.0	101.7	1.3	0.50
Residential	34	1,898,387	1,832,800	103.2	96.5	97.6	1.1	0.17
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	34	1,898,387	1,832,800	103.2	96.5	97.6	1.1	0.17
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	66	5,184,899	5,513,400	123.1	106.3	100.0	1.2	0.34

<b>Ward County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	26	2,639,140	1,648,400	60.1	62.5	59.1	1.0	0.32
Commercial	39	5,706,279	5,544,300	101.0	97.2	98.9	1.0	0.14
Vacant Lots	41	700,194	597,200	95.4	85.3	88.8	1.1	0.45
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	80	6,406,473	6,141,500	98.1	95.9	97.1	1.0	0.29
Residential	149	11,452,403	11,636,500	127.6	101.6	99.4	1.3	0.46
Lakeshore	3	108,000	83,200	69.6	77.0	82.5	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	152	11,560,403	11,719,700	126.5	101.4	99.2	1.3	0.45
Mobile Homes	151	2,404,650	2,668,688	173.2	111.0	106.7	1.6	0.84
Total County	409	23,010,666	22,178,288	134.0	96.4	99.0	1.4	0.59

<b>City of Minot</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	48	10,161,600	10,206,400	96.8	100.4	100.7	1.0	0.10
Vacant Lots	20	655,331	525,400	91.7	8.2	61.6	1.1	0.83
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	68	10,816,931	10,731,800	95.3	99.2	96.8	1.0	0.28
Residential	481	42,207,548	40,775,180	96.9	96.6	96.6	1.0	0.08
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	481	42,207,548	40,775,180	96.9	96.6	96.6	1.0	0.08
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	549	53,024,479	51,506,980	96.7	97.1	96.6	1.0	0.10

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>Wells County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	22	1,268,308	1,175,020	94.4	92.6	94.6	1.0	0.20
Commercial	30	1,261,345	1,088,850	98.9	86.3	100.0	1.2	0.20
Vacant Lots	1	6,000	4,200	70.0	70.0	70.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	31	1,267,345	1,093,050	98.0	86.2	99.9	1.1	0.20
Residential	31	1,187,450	1,171,690	114.9	98.7	99.5	1.2	0.28
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	31	1,187,450	1,171,690	114.9	98.7	99.5	1.2	0.28
Mobile Homes	1	25,785	28,408	110.2	110.2	110.2	0.0	0.00
Total County	85	3,748,888	3,468,168	103.4	92.5	99.9	1.1	0.23

<b>Williams County</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	33	3,452,648	2,198,480	66.0	63.7	62.3	1.0	0.19
Commercial	35	1,446,488	1,333,950	105.6	92.2	103.3	1.2	0.21
Vacant Lots	18	127,600	72,670	83.3	57.0	64.0	1.5	0.75
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	53	1,574,088	1,406,620	98.0	89.4	97.4	1.1	0.37
Residential	49	2,600,460	2,239,944	95.1	86.1	89.1	1.1	0.22
Lakeshore	7	190,000	169,250	104.1	89.1	74.3	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	56	2,790,460	2,409,194	96.2	86.3	88.0	1.1	0.25
Mobile Homes	6	56,900	64,396	159.9	113.2	129.1	0.0	0.00
Total County	148	7,874,096	6,078,690	92.7	77.2	83.7	1.2	0.36

<b>City of Williston</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Commercial	30	4,679,685	4,350,100	104.0	93.0	100.4	1.1	0.16
Vacant Lots	1	40,000	14,800	37.0	37.0	37.0	0.0	0.00
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	31	4,719,685	4,364,900	101.8	92.5	100.0	1.1	0.18
Residential	182	10,447,831	9,831,400	96.2	94.1	95.3	1.0	0.11
Lakeshore	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total Res. & Lakeshore	182	10,447,831	9,831,400	96.2	94.1	95.3	1.0	0.11
Mobile Homes	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00
Total City	213	15,167,516	14,196,300	97.0	93.6	96.0	1.0	0.13

**Table 1 Continued**  
**2003 Real Estate Assessment / Sales Ratio Study**

<b>State</b>	-----Sales Ratio-----							
	Total Sales	Verified Price	Assessed Valuation	Arith. Mean	Agg. Mean	Median	PRD	COD
Agricultural	1,161	115,975,972	81,929,524	79.1	70.6	72.4	1.1	0.31
Commercial	1,715	229,000,422	220,611,634	107.7	96.3	100.0	1.1	0.22
Vacant Lots	685	17,727,876	9,824,221	81.5	55.4	60.2	1.5	0.73
Total Comm. & Vac. Lots	2,400	246,728,298	230,435,855	100.2	93.4	97.5	1.1	0.33
Residential	7,041	575,266,766	534,852,704	101.8	93.0	94.4	1.1	0.20
Lakeshore	100	4,618,033	2,247,236	61.1	48.7	50.6	1.3	0.57
Total Res. & Lakeshore	7,141	579,884,799	537,099,940	101.2	92.6	94.3	1.1	0.20
Mobile Homes	581	9,968,260	9,939,100	130.3	99.7	98.9	1.3	0.52
<b>Total State</b>	<b>11,283</b>	<b>952,557,329</b>	<b>859,404,419</b>	<b>100.2</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.26</b>

**TABLE 2**  
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES WITHIN A GIVEN PERCENTAGE GROUPING**

County - City		Under 45	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	105	110	115	120	125	130	135	Over 140	Total Sales
Adams-	Township	0	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Barnes-	Township	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	2	3	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	46
Valley City-Urban	Township	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	19	36	19	11	3	1	0	1	2	0	1
Benson-	Township	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	2	2	2	3	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	29
Billings-	Township	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Bottineau-	Township	29	2	7	3	4	2	1	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	64
Bowman-	Township	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Burke-	Township	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Burleigh-	Township	1	0	3	4	1	0	0	3	3	5	5	29	16	12	5	1	0	2	1	0	1	8
Bismarck-	Urban	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	11	18	18	27	15	8	5	2	1	0	2	1	0	47
Cass-	Township	17	7	9	11	8	6	9	10	6	12	10	20	7	6	5	1	1	2	1	1	1	150
Fargo-	Urban	8	4	10	8	9	10	14	17	20	33	28	24	21	12	5	6	5	2	5	2	17	260
	Urban	0	0	0	0	11	24	49	87	143	238	229	245	132	80	26	9	10	2	2	4	11	1302

**TABLE 2 Continued**  
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES WITHIN A GIVEN PERCENTAGE GROUPING**

County - City		Under 45	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	105	110	115	120	125	130	135	Over 140	Total Sales	
<b>West Fargo</b>	Urban	33	19	7	7	6	6	3	11	39	59	57	76	49	7	7	6	2	0	0	1	2	397	
<b>Cavalier-</b>	<b>Township</b>	4	4	5	7	4	10	5	2	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
<b>Dickey-</b>	<b>Township</b>	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	2	4	8	12	9	6	6	6	2	1	3	1	6	80	
<b>Divide-</b>	<b>Township</b>	2	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	8	12	10	6	7	3	1	4	2	4	0	7	28
<b>Dunn-</b>	<b>Township</b>	1	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	
<b>Eddy-</b>	<b>Township</b>	5	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	
<b>Emmons-</b>	<b>Township</b>	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	
<b>Foster-</b>	<b>Township</b>	4	3	4	4	7	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	47	
<b>Golden Valley</b>	<b>Township</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	11	
<b>Grand Forks</b>	<b>Township</b>	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	57	
<b>Grand Forks</b>	<b>Urban</b>	3	2	0	0	2	7	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	
<b>Grant-</b>	<b>Township</b>	7	1	5	1	2	2	4	10	8	9	9	5	5	5	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	18	
<b>Grant-</b>	<b>Urban</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	144	143	65	32	13	7	5	3	0	4	
		1	1	4	4	5	2	0	0	3	2	2	2	1	7	12	17	2	2	0	0	0	31	
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43		

**TABLE 2 Continued**  
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES WITHIN A GIVEN PERCENTAGE GROUPING**

County - City		Under 45	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	105	110	115	120	125	130	135	Over 140	Total Sales
<b>Griggs-</b> Township		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	4	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	17
Urban		0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	7	4	18	13	3	2	0	1	1	3	1	1	59
<b>Hettinger-</b> Township		3	1	2	0	5	2	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Urban		1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	9	10	13	2	4	2	1	0	0	1	0	47
<b>Kidder-</b> Township		11	0	2	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	10	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	36
Urban		0	1	3	1	2	1	1	8	2	4	4	4	5	0	2	1	2	1	1	11	56	
<b>LaMoure-</b> Township		0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	17
Urban		0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	2	4	5	12	6	6	6	4	5	3	3	1	3	69
<b>Logan-</b> Township		2	1	3	5	4	8	2	2	1	3	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	41
Urban		2	0	2	0	2	3	2	1	5	2	5	7	13	5	3	0	3	0	2	2	9	68
<b>McHenry-</b> Township		3	1	5	2	4	1	2	3	4	2	5	5	1	3	3	1	0	2	3	0	0	2
Urban		6	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	5	2	6	6	4	2	0	1	2	1	3	17
<b>McIntosh-</b> Township		1	1	3	8	8	9	5	9	5	1	4	6	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	1	46
Urban		1	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4	4	3	16	5	2	3	4	1	4	4	1	3	74
<b>McKenzie-</b> Township		2	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	70
Urban		0	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3	11	18	9	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	67
<b>McLean-</b> Township		17	6	3	6	6	6	4	6	0	6	5	6	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	80
Urban		6	3	6	7	9	7	7	11	18	9	12	8	9	4	2	6	6	3	3	0	37	173
<b>Mercer-</b> Township		3	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	1	2	2	10	7	14	24	16	28	7	5	1	1
Urban		0	1	3	1	1	1	3	4	10	7	14	24	16	28	7	5	1	3	2	2	2	13
<b>Morton-</b> Township		8	2	13	4	8	2	8	10	12	6	3	2	5	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	91
Urban		4	2	4	6	5	9	5	9	7	4	8	2	17	8	2	5	1	1	2	2	33	136

TABLE 2 Continued  
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES WITHIN A GIVEN PERCENTAGE GROUPING

**TABLE 2 Continued**  
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES WITHIN A GIVEN PERCENTAGE GROUPING**

County - City		Under 45	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	105	110	115	120	125	130	135	Over 140	Total Sales
<b>Rolette-</b> Township		0	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	25	
Urban		3	1	1	1	3	4	2	5	8	10	9	13	7	0	0	1	5	2	0	13	89	
<b>Sargent-</b> Township		2	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	1	4	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	
Urban		3	0	0	2	0	2	5	0	1	4	2	4	5	7	3	1	4	1	0	0	52	
<b>Sheridan-</b> Township		0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	
Urban		0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	1	9	5	2	0	2	2	0	1	3	39	
<b>Sioux-</b> Township		3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Urban		4	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	34	
<b>Slope-</b> Township		2	0	2	1	3	2	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Urban		3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	
<b>Stark-</b> Township		9	1	3	0	0	5	0	2	0	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	34	
Urban		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	11	2	28	4	5	3	2	1	1	2	72	
<b>Dickinson-</b> Urban		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	22	31	43	34	18	15	16	6	3	5	4	1	204	
<b>Steele-</b> Township		0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Urban		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	7	9	7	5	1	1	0	2	0	49	
<b>Stutsman-</b> Township		0	0	2	2	7	8	9	7	4	0	2	3	3	3	2	1	4	6	1	1	56	
Urban		1	0	0	0	2	4	4	3	4	8	4	4	13	2	1	4	6	1	2	1	76	
<b>Jamestown</b> Urban		7	1	1	3	8	7	4	9	16	30	29	34	34	7	12	8	4	3	3	4	233	
<b>Towner-</b> Township		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	5	3	4	1	0	3	0	0	3	27	
Urban		3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4	4	9	7	3	0	2	3	22	72	
<b>Trail-</b> Township		3	3	2	11	4	6	7	2	4	1	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	10	63	
Urban		4	3	4	2	3	3	1	2	7	8	10	8	17	13	6	0	3	3	2	4	18	
																						121	

**TABLE 2 Continued**  
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES WITHIN A GIVEN PERCENTAGE GROUPING**

County - City		Under 45	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	105	110	115	120	125	130	135	Over 140	Total Sales
Walsh-Township	Urban	4	0	2	1	0	4	3	5	2	1	2	2	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	5	39
Grafton-Township	Urban	1	0	0	1	5	3	3	1	8	2	5	6	16	2	2	0	2	1	1	1	13	73
Ward-Township	Urban	20	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	7	5	10	10	7	3	1	1	2	2	0	11	66
Minot-Township	Urban	6	2	1	4	5	3	4	13	38	49	100	141	91	48	23	7	3	0	1	5	5	549
Wells-Township	Urban	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	23	62
Williams-Township	Urban	9	7	1	5	11	5	11	6	5	6	7	1	5	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	6	90
Williston-Township	Urban	1	1	0	0	3	2	4	14	20	23	29	37	26	16	10	10	5	4	2	0	6	213
Total State-Township		230	82	119	119	129	150	140	154	138	128	151	135	130	66	50	28	40	20	21	12	119	2,161
Total State-Urban		214	61	79	90	141	171	235	378	672	1,045	1,323	1,496	1,222	483	289	185	153	103	106	69	607	9,122
Grand Total-		444	143	198	209	270	321	375	532	810	1,173	1,474	1,631	1,352	549	339	213	193	123	127	81	726	11,283

**Table 3**  
**Characteristics of the Sample**

County	Residential				Commercial			
	2002 Sales	Old Sales	Appraisals	Total	2002 Sales	Old Sales	Appraisals	Total
<b>Adams</b>	37	0	0	37	3	3	27	33
<b>Barnes</b>	29	25	0	54	5	9	16	30
<b>City of Valley City</b>	71	0	0	71	7	7	17	31
<b>Benson</b>	18	22	0	40	5	11	12	28
<b>Billings</b>	2	1	13	16	0	1	6	7
<b>Bottineau</b>	51	0	0	51	5	19	6	30
<b>Bowman</b>	30	0	0	30	0	19	0	19
<b>Burke</b>	19	15	0	34	1	1	29	31
<b>Burleigh</b>	78	0	0	78	0	2	12	14
<b>City of Bismarck</b>	695	0	0	695	34	0	0	34
<b>Cass</b>	233	0	0	233	13	26	0	39
<b>City of Fargo</b>	1,251	0	0	1,251	51	0	0	51
<b>City of West Fargo</b>	272	0	0	272	13	27	0	40
<b>Cavalier</b>	24	24	0	48	2	9	19	30
<b>Dickey</b>	51	0	0	51	8	8	14	30
<b>Divide</b>	13	17	0	30	2	3	5	10
<b>Dunn</b>	7	25	0	32	1	0	13	14
<b>Eddy</b>	11	27	0	38	0	0	9	9
<b>Emmons</b>	30	0	0	30	4	14	9	27
<b>Foster</b>	23	24	0	47	4	0	18	22
<b>Golden Valley</b>	24	13	0	37	1	6	2	9
<b>Grand Forks</b>	141	0	0	141	9	15	6	30
<b>City of Grand Forks</b>	607	0	0	607	34	0	0	34
<b>Grant</b>	11	19	1	31	3	2	6	11
<b>Griggs</b>	9	29	0	38	0	6	12	18
<b>Hettinger</b>	17	15	0	32	2	3	8	13
<b>Kidder</b>	25	20	0	45	2	6	4	12
<b>LaMoure</b>	20	22	0	42	0	2	26	28
<b>Logan</b>	26	21	0	47	1	8	6	15
<b>McHenry</b>	41	0	0	41	4	13	13	30
<b>McIntosh</b>	21	21	0	42	2	8	13	23
<b>McKenzie</b>	22	15	0	37	2	6	13	21
<b>McLean</b>	114	0	0	114	12	32	0	44

**Table 3**  
**Characteristics of the Sample**

	Residential			Commercial				
County	2002 Sales	Old Sales	Appraisals	2002 Sales	Old Sales	Appraisals	Total	
<b>Mercer</b>	105	0	0	105	6	12	15	33
<b>Morton</b>	78	0	0	78	6	17	7	30
<b>City of Mandan</b>	182	0	0	182	11	37	0	48
<b>Mountrail</b>	19	18	0	37	1	5	24	30
<b>Nelson</b>	33	0	0	33	8	10	0	18
<b>Oliver</b>	8	25	0	33	0	3	0	3
<b>Pembina</b>	62	0	0	62	6	24	0	30
<b>Pierce</b>	40	0	0	40	3	3	24	30
<b>Ramsey</b>	25	26	0	51	0	4	21	25
<b>City of Devils Lake</b>	56	0	0	56	7	26	0	33
<b>Ransom</b>	47	0	0	47	0	3	27	30
<b>Renville</b>	22	24	0	46	3	15	2	20
<b>Richland</b>	53	0	0	53	6	12	12	30
<b>City of Wahpeton</b>	81	0	0	81	8	15	7	30
<b>Rolette</b>	29	32	0	61	1	9	19	29
<b>Sargent</b>	31	0	0	31	3	2	11	16
<b>Sheridan</b>	22	10	0	32	0	1	4	5
<b>Sioux</b>	9	9	12	30	1	0	4	5
<b>Slope</b>	3	8	4	15	1	2	2	5
<b>Stark</b>	38	0	0	38	0	8	22	30
<b>City of Dickinson</b>	167	0	0	167	23	9	0	32
<b>Steele</b>	8	26	0	34	1	3	12	16
<b>Stutsman</b>	40	0	0	40	4	4	22	30
<b>City of Jamestown</b>	181	0	0	181	12	23	0	35
<b>Towner</b>	23	18	0	41	6	11	13	30
<b>Traill</b>	105	0	0	105	16	16	0	32
<b>Walsh</b>	44	0	0	44	1	17	12	30
<b>City of Grafton</b>	34	0	0	34	6	9	16	31
<b>Ward</b>	149	0	0	149	10	29	0	39
<b>City of Minot</b>	481	0	0	481	25	23	0	48
<b>Wells</b>	31	0	0	31	3	17	10	30
<b>Williams</b>	49	0	0	49	7	28	0	35
<b>City of Williston</b>	182	0	0	182	9	20	1	30
County Total	2,200	551	30	2,781	184	487	567	1,238
City Total	4,260	0	0	4,260	240	196	41	477
State Total	6,460	551	30	7,041	424	683	608	1,715

**Table 4**  
**Median Ratios and Coefficients of Dispersion for Residential Property**

Residential										
County	Median Ratio					COD				
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>Adams</b>	99.4	99.6	103.6	113.6	97.6	0.31	0.15	0.20	0.28	0.63
<b>Barnes</b>	97.5	92.4	97.5	90.4	90.1	0.42	0.28	0.27	0.34	0.28
<b>City of Valley City</b>	97.7	98.6	98.8	97.3	97.7	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07
<b>Benson</b>	99.7	100.0	95.1	93.7	95.2	0.27	0.21	0.21	0.25	0.30
<b>Billings</b>	100.0	100.0	98.6	100.0	100.0	0.04	0.04	0.11	0.02	0.06
<b>Bottineau</b>	95.8	100.8	99.3	96.4	91.1	0.22	0.32	0.38	0.32	0.32
<b>Bowman</b>	98.2	93.5	100.9	104.0	100.1	0.33	0.28	0.22	0.21	0.27
<b>Burke</b>	101.5	101.9	100.7	98.9	101.6	0.16	0.36	0.36	0.32	0.61
<b>Burleigh</b>	96.9	95.7	92.1	93.7	94.6	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.06
<b>City of Bismarck</b>	94.4	94.8	94.2	94.3	93.7	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.05
<b>Cass</b>	91.5	89.5	92.6	91.3	89.3	0.21	0.22	0.23	0.24	0.18
<b>City of Fargo</b>	90.0	93.4	94.1	90.7	92.4	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.10
<b>City of West Fargo</b>	94.9	94.2	93.9	93.7	94.0	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.08
<b>Cavalier</b>	103.6	96.4	100.1	98.1	100.1	0.34	0.22	0.28	0.22	0.18
<b>Dickey</b>	89.4	95.5	95.5	86.4	97.5	0.68	0.34	0.25	0.32	0.65
<b>Divide</b>	99.4	92.1	96.4	98.7	107.0	0.66	0.68	0.59	0.40	0.34
<b>Dunn</b>	98.1	98.0	97.3	97.1	97.2	0.22	0.18	0.19	0.11	0.12
<b>Eddy</b>	94.7	93.7	98.2	100.0	100.8	0.15	0.13	0.14	0.26	0.20
<b>Emmons</b>	96.9	96.6	100.0	104.6	115.3	0.35	0.28	0.43	0.22	0.49
<b>Foster</b>	98.2	93.3	98.0	98.2	98.3	0.13	0.22	0.15	0.14	0.15
<b>Golden Valley</b>	101.5	99.4	97.1	96.8	91.0	0.13	0.09	0.15	0.21	0.53
<b>Grand Forks</b>	91.8	95.4	96.3	92.2	91.0	0.28	0.36	0.28	0.50	0.38
<b>City of Grand Forks</b>	92.6	98.2	96.9	94.3	92.8	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07
<b>Grant</b>	97.8	97.4	97.0	99.5	98.7	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.05
<b>Griggs</b>	99.3	99.3	98.9	97.9	97.4	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10
<b>Hettinger</b>	95.5	101.8	98.9	100.0	97.3	0.13	0.24	0.08	0.10	0.11
<b>Kidder</b>	106.2	106.2	92.3	100.5	97.6	0.97	0.32	0.35	0.27	0.28
<b>LaMoure</b>	102.5	101.4	95.3	94.2	93.0	0.19	0.21	0.23	0.22	0.23
<b>Logan</b>	99.4	100.0	101.0	100.0	100.0	0.19	0.10	0.19	0.19	0.25
<b>McHenry</b>	84.0	97.1	95.7	97.2	98.8	0.33	0.52	0.21	1.57	0.97
<b>McIntosh</b>	98.2	101.1	104.0	98.4	96.9	0.29	0.29	0.30	0.25	0.19
<b>McKenzie</b>	100.1	100.1	102.7	96.5	98.2	0.10	0.11	0.15	0.12	0.15
<b>McLean</b>	100.3	99.8	97.3	100.7	90.9	0.84	0.32	0.45	0.29	0.44

**Table 4 Continued**  
**Median Ratios and Coefficients of Dispersion for Residential Property**

Residential										
County	Median Ratio					COD				
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>Mercer</b>	88.9	97.2	101.0	99.7	95.8	0.42	0.17	0.25	0.17	0.21
<b>Morton</b>	96.0	95.0	93.0	95.6	92.3	0.34	0.44	0.29	0.33	0.40
<b>City of Mandan</b>	92.0	94.6	95.1	92.6	93.2	0.07	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.09
<b>Mountrail</b>	97.1	97.6	99.7	95.9	85.7	0.27	0.22	0.22	0.26	0.35
<b>Nelson</b>	100.0	102.0	96.7	101.7	97.7	0.86	0.89	0.63	0.54	0.77
<b>Oliver</b>	98.9	100.1	100.1	99.5	98.8	0.24	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.13
<b>Pembina</b>	91.7	92.3	101.8	93.4	100.2	0.26	0.26	0.36	0.35	0.54
<b>Pierce</b>	93.4	97.3	95.8	93.8	92.9	0.15	0.13	0.31	0.32	0.21
<b>Ramsey</b>	96.2	93.5	95.5	96.4	95.4	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.15	0.16
<b>City of Devils Lake</b>	96.4	95.4	95.2	92.2	96.9	0.16	0.15	0.25	0.18	0.18
<b>Ransom</b>	87.1	94.4	93.6	94.8	98.0	0.35	0.26	0.30	0.32	0.22
<b>Renville</b>	102.2	100.0	96.2	96.6	96.2	0.61	0.39	0.46	0.54	0.53
<b>Richland</b>	95.1	95.6	98.4	96.9	95.0	0.21	0.33	0.20	0.22	0.16
<b>City of Wahpeton</b>	97.1	95.1	96.5	90.9	98.1	0.15	0.12	0.12	0.16	0.20
<b>Rolette</b>	98.8	95.9	97.3	110.7	98.1	0.20	0.18	0.46	0.44	0.41
<b>Sargent</b>	98.0	92.1	96.7	90.8	95.7	0.28	0.23	0.28	0.27	0.23
<b>Sheridan</b>	96.7	101.2	101.4	96.8	98.8	0.22	0.34	0.31	0.23	0.89
<b>Sioux</b>	99.6	100.0	100.5	99.3	100.0	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.80	1.90
<b>Slope</b>	96.0	96.0	99.4	101.3	100.0	0.29	0.24	0.30	0.39	0.35
<b>Stark</b>	90.6	93.0	95.1	93.4	94.1	0.07	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.12
<b>City of Dickinson</b>	91.1	96.5	96.6	94.6	94.9	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.10
<b>Steele</b>	83.8	102.7	102.8	95.6	93.3	0.66	0.57	0.42	0.21	0.25
<b>Stutsman</b>	93.6	87.0	95.3	96.2	98.3	0.37	0.33	0.24	0.24	0.25
<b>City of Jamestown</b>	90.1	93.4	94.7	93.9	95.6	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.16
<b>Towner</b>	113.6	104.5	104.8	108.3	96.0	0.37	0.81	0.94	0.78	0.85
<b>Traill</b>	93.1	92.8	97.8	89.9	96.1	0.33	0.33	0.30	0.35	0.31
<b>Walsh</b>	91.5	94.5	95.4	103.0	95.6	0.62	0.29	0.39	0.23	0.41
<b>City of Grafton</b>	95.6	99.0	89.7	98.4	97.6	0.20	0.27	0.37	0.17	0.17
<b>Ward</b>	93.2	93.7	93.8	97.9	99.4	0.31	0.32	0.26	0.23	0.46
<b>City of Minot</b>	97.9	97.2	97.4	98.3	96.6	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.08
<b>Wells</b>	95.1	100.0	93.7	99.9	99.5	1.08	0.61	0.44	0.54	0.28
<b>Williams</b>	96.2	96.7	96.7	94.5	89.1	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.30	0.22
<b>City of Williston</b>	96.4	96.0	96.6	95.4	95.3	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.11
<b>State</b>	94.0	95.8	96.0	94.7	94.4	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.20

**Table 5**  
**Median Ratios and Coefficients of Dispersion for Commercial Property**

County	Commercial									
	Median Ratio					COD				
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>Adams</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.26	0.17
<b>Barnes</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.5	111.3	0.15	0.14	0.19	0.18	1.11
<b>City of Valley City</b>	100.6	100.9	99.9	102.1	96.6	0.34	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.05
<b>Benson</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.37	0.25
<b>Billings</b>	97.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Bottineau</b>	100.9	100.9	100.9	98.9	99.9	0.17	0.18	0.20	0.22	0.22
<b>Bowman</b>	93.5	93.3	99.6	99.0	97.8	0.29	0.25	0.26	0.22	0.17
<b>Burke</b>	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.14	0.00
<b>Burleigh</b>	99.5	99.6	98.8	98.1	97.8	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.03
<b>City of Bismarck</b>	94.0	95.6	93.5	95.1	94.3	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.08	0.07
<b>Cass</b>	94.6	97.3	97.7	96.9	101.0	0.39	0.38	0.40	0.33	0.27
<b>City of Fargo</b>	94.0	94.7	90.8	93.4	93.4	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.17
<b>City of West Fargo</b>	96.2	96.6	96.8	95.4	97.5	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.11
<b>Cavalier</b>	98.0	100.5	97.1	98.7	98.7	0.12	0.13	0.08	0.07	0.11
<b>Dickey</b>	97.7	102.5	98.7	98.6	95.9	0.27	0.29	0.25	0.13	0.14
<b>Divide</b>	97.7	109.7	105.0	102.8	104.5	0.42	0.37	0.28	0.28	0.28
<b>Dunn</b>	100.0	100.7	100.5	102.7	101.6	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.04
<b>Eddy</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.08
<b>Emmons</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.14	0.18	0.14	0.51	0.23
<b>Foster</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14
<b>Golden Valley</b>	100.0	101.0	100.7	102.3	100.0	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.10	0.13
<b>Grand Forks</b>	104.1	104.3	104.3	100.0	97.7	0.65	0.69	0.65	0.38	0.49
<b>City of Grand Forks</b>	96.5	92.0	97.3	97.0	93.4	0.13	0.17	0.12	0.12	0.12
<b>Grant</b>	101.0	101.0	100.0	100.3	101.0	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.94	0.04
<b>Griggs</b>	98.8	100.7	97.1	98.6	98.4	0.06	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.11
<b>Hettinger</b>	100.8	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02
<b>Kidder</b>	104.1	96.6	103.0	99.6	95.6	0.14	0.24	0.27	0.30	0.32
<b>LaMoure</b>	102.7	102.7	102.3	102.3	101.5	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.10
<b>Logan</b>	95.0	95.4	98.5	100.3	100.3	0.12	0.20	0.09	0.06	0.08
<b>McHenry</b>	100.3	100.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.19	0.12	0.39	0.67	0.58
<b>McIntosh</b>	97.5	99.8	100.5	99.0	98.0	0.16	0.15	0.14	0.12	0.11
<b>McKenzie</b>	98.5	100.0	100.9	100.0	100.0	0.16	0.14	0.18	0.10	0.07
<b>McLean</b>	100.0	100.0	100.9	108.1	93.0	0.35	0.71	1.09	0.79	0.74

**Table 5 Continued**  
**Median Ratios and Coefficients of Dispersion for Commercial Property**

Commercial										
County	Median Ratio					COD				
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>Mercer</b>	100.0	100.0	98.2	99.0	97.8	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04
<b>Morton</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.23	0.24	0.40	0.75	0.79
<b>City of Mandan</b>	93.7	94.8	94.5	94.2	90.2	0.13	0.11	0.15	0.17	0.15
<b>Mountrail</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.35
<b>Nelson</b>	103.9	99.1	95.9	95.9	95.9	0.41	1.27	1.52	1.51	0.49
<b>Oliver</b>	104.2	104.2	98.5	98.6	98.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Pembina</b>	100.0	99.8	100.0	100.0	95.7	0.39	0.33	0.43	0.27	0.26
<b>Pierce</b>	100.9	101.0	101.7	104.5	101.9	0.13	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.04
<b>Ramsey</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.04	0.03
<b>City of Devils Lake</b>	101.6	92.2	95.6	95.9	95.9	0.27	0.23	0.22	0.23	0.23
<b>Ransom</b>	100.0	99.8	98.3	100.2	99.8	0.16	0.13	0.08	0.03	0.03
<b>Renville</b>	103.8	103.9	103.8	101.9	103.4	0.12	0.25	0.26	0.28	0.32
<b>Richland</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.4	0.12	0.26	0.16	0.10	0.16
<b>City of Wahpeton</b>	95.6	96.5	98.1	100.0	100.0	0.18	0.17	0.15	0.12	0.13
<b>Rolette</b>	97.7	93.8	99.0	96.5	101.2	0.33	0.29	0.24	0.11	0.12
<b>Sargent</b>	97.5	97.1	97.4	99.7	106.1	0.13	0.12	0.13	0.60	0.09
<b>Sheridan</b>	100.3	100.4	99.5	100.3	99.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Sioux</b>	100.4	99.6	99.6	98.0	108.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Slope</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Stark</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.10	0.07	0.04	0.32	0.32
<b>City of Dickinson</b>	97.5	99.3	98.6	93.0	98.3	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.12
<b>Steele</b>	97.5	97.5	97.3	98.3	98.5	0.12	0.14	0.13	0.09	0.07
<b>Stutsman</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.15
<b>City of Jamestown</b>	93.9	91.9	96.4	95.0	96.3	0.20	0.13	0.17	0.11	0.13
<b>Towner</b>	97.5	100.0	99.8	95.2	108.4	0.23	0.31	0.39	0.40	0.47
<b>Traill</b>	98.2	96.2	100.0	99.7	100.1	0.36	0.38	0.46	0.40	0.35
<b>Walsh</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.28	0.30	0.23	0.23	0.16
<b>City of Grafton</b>	100.0	100.0	106.7	100.7	102.0	0.14	0.12	0.26	0.31	0.51
<b>Ward</b>	94.1	100.0	98.9	98.7	98.9	0.38	0.29	0.19	0.20	0.14
<b>City of Minot</b>	97.5	100.0	100.1	99.3	100.7	0.14	0.13	0.17	0.13	0.10
<b>Wells</b>	101.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.60	0.55	0.40	0.48	0.20
<b>Williams</b>	97.6	100.0	100.0	95.9	103.3	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.18	0.21
<b>City of Williston</b>	99.2	98.8	99.2	101.1	100.4	0.13	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16
<b>State</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.23	0.22

**Table 6**  
**2003 Median Ratios and Changes by the State Board of Equalization**

Residential				
County	Median Ratio	* Adjustment Worksheet	Indicated Change	State Board Change
<b>Adams</b>	97.6	102.8	-3%	0.0%
<b>Barnes</b>	90.1	99.2	0%	0.0%
<b>City of Valley City</b>	97.7	101.7	-2%	0.0%
<b>Benson</b>	95.2	96.2	3%	0.0%
<b>Billings</b>	100.0	100.5	-1%	0.0%
<b>Bottineau</b>	91.1	101.1	-2%	0.0%
<b>Bowman</b>	100.1	105.2	-5%	0.0%
<b>Burke</b>	101.6	101.5	-2%	0.0%
<b>Burleigh</b>	94.6	96.3	3%	0.0%
<b>City of Bismarck</b>	93.7	96.6	3%	0.0%
<b>Cass</b>	89.3	94.5	5%	0.0%
<b>City of Fargo</b>	92.4	96.9	3%	0.0%
<b>City of West Fargo</b>	94.0	99.6	0%	0.0%
<b>Cavalier</b>	100.1	99.2	0%	0.0%
<b>Dickey</b>	97.5	98.8	1%	0.0%
<b>Divide</b>	107.0	101.8	-2%	0.0%
<b>Dunn</b>	97.2	97.9	2%	0.0%
<b>Eddy</b>	100.8	101.1	-2%	0.0%
<b>Emmons *</b>	115.3	115.4	-14%	-7.0%
<b>Foster</b>	98.3	98.2	1%	0.0%
<b>Golden Valley *</b>	91.0	93.4	7%	0.0%
<b>Grand Forks</b>	91.0	96.0	4%	0.0%
<b>City of Grand Forks</b>	92.8	96.6	3%	0.0%
<b>Grant</b>	98.7	98.4	1%	0.0%
<b>Griggs</b>	97.4	97.4	2%	0.0%
<b>Hettinger</b>	97.3	98.7	1%	0.0%
<b>Kidder *</b>	97.6	115.9	-14%	0.0%
<b>LaMoure</b>	93.0	94.8	5%	0.0%
<b>Logan</b>	100.0	100.2	-1%	0.0%
<b>McHenry</b>	98.8	102.3	-3%	0.0%
<b>McIntosh</b>	96.9	96.9	3%	0.0%
<b>McKenzie</b>	98.2	98.1	1%	0.0%
<b>McLean</b>	90.9	95.1	5%	0.0%

\* Adjustment worksheet ratios are the result of increases and decreases of property after changes in the county.

The State Board of Equalization allows a 5% tolerance of the median ratio after the adjustment worksheet is completed. A change is made only if the indicated change is more than plus or minus 5%.

\*Emmons county needs a 14% decrease. The State Board reduced residential property assessments 7 percent and directed Emmons county to reappraise the residential property for the 2004 assessment.

\*Golden Valley county needs a 7% increase. The State Board voted to make no change for this year and directed Golden Valley to complete the reappraisal of residential property in the City of Beach for the 2004 assessment and in the rest of the county for 2005.

\*Kidder county needs a 14% decrease. The 2003 reappraisal of lakeshore property skewed the results of the study. Inspection of residential properties separately from lakeshore properties shows residential property assessments need a 2% increase and are within tolerance, and lakeshore property assessments need an 11% increase. The State Board voted to make no change to residential and lakeshore property for this year and directed the Tax Director to continue his efforts to bring lakeshore assessments up to market value.

**Table 6**  
**2003 Median Ratios and Changes by the State Board of Equalization**

Residential

County	Median Ratio	* Adjustment Worksheet	Indicated Change	State Board Change
<b>Mercer</b>	95.8	99.9	0%	0.0%
<b>Morton</b>	92.3	96.6	3%	0.0%
<b>City of Mandan</b>	93.2	99.4	0%	0.0%
<b>Mountrail</b>	85.7	95.4	4%	0.0%
<b>Nelson</b>	97.7	97.7	2%	0.0%
<b>Oliver</b>	98.8	98.8	1%	0.0%
<b>Pembina</b>	100.2	99.4	0%	0.0%
<b>Pierce</b>	92.9	95.0	5%	0.0%
<b>Ramsey</b>	95.4	98.7	1%	0.0%
<b>City of Devils Lake</b>	96.9	97.3	2%	0.0%
<b>Ransom</b>	98.0	98.3	1%	0.0%
<b>Renville</b>	96.2	96.2	3%	0.0%
<b>Richland</b>	95.0	97.0	3%	0.0%
<b>City of Wahpeton</b>	98.1	98.0	2%	0.0%
<b>Rolette</b>	98.1	97.3	2%	0.0%
<b>Sargent</b>	95.7	95.4	4%	0.0%
<b>Sheridan</b>	98.8	99.1	0%	0.0%
<b>Sioux</b>	100.0	98.7	1%	0.0%
<b>Slope</b>	100.0	101.7	-2%	0.0%
<b>Stark</b>	94.1	100.3	-1%	0.0%
<b>City of Dickinson</b>	94.9	96.9	3%	0.0%
<b>Steele</b>	93.3	95.2	5%	0.0%
<b>Stutsman</b>	98.3	102.0	-2%	0.0%
<b>City of Jamestown</b>	95.6	96.6	3%	0.0%
<b>Towner</b>	113.5	95.9	4%	0.0%
<b>Traill</b>	96.1	97.6	2%	0.0%
<b>Walsh</b>	95.6	96.3	3%	0.0%
<b>City of Grafton</b>	97.6	97.6	2%	0.0%
<b>Ward</b>	99.4	100.6	-1%	0.0%
<b>City of Minot</b>	96.6	98.5	1%	0.0%
<b>Wells</b>	99.5	100.0	-1%	0.0%
<b>Williams</b>	89.1	95.3	4%	0.0%
<b>City of Williston</b>	95.3	97.9	2%	0.0%
<b>State</b>	94.4			

**Table 7**  
**2003 Median Ratios and Changes by the State Board of Equalization**

Commercial

County	Median Ratio	* Adjustment Worksheet	Indicated Change	State Board Change
<b>Adams</b>	100.1	99.2	0%	0.0%
<b>Barnes</b>	100.0	97.0	3%	0.0%
<b>City of Valley City</b>	96.6	99.9	0%	0.0%
<b>Benson</b>	100.0	98.9	1%	0.0%
<b>Billings</b>	100.0	100.1	-1%	0.0%
<b>Bottineau</b>	99.9	101.7	-2%	0.0%
<b>Bowman</b>	97.8	99.4	0%	0.0%
<b>Burke</b>	100.0	100.0	-1%	0.0%
<b>Burleigh</b>	97.8	103.1	-4%	0.0%
<b>City of Bismarck</b>	94.3	97.1	3%	0.0%
<b>Cass</b>	101.0	102.2	-3%	0.0%
<b>City of Fargo</b>	93.4	97.6	2%	0.0%
<b>City of West Fargo</b>	97.5	100.4	-1%	0.0%
<b>Cavalier</b>	98.7	95.1	5%	0.0%
<b>Dickey *</b>	95.9	90.5	10%	0.0%
<b>Divide</b>	104.5	101.2	-2%	0.0%
<b>Dunn</b>	101.6	101.5	-2%	0.0%
<b>Eddy</b>	100.0	99.8	0%	0.0%
<b>Emmons</b>	100.0	100.0	0%	0.0%
<b>Foster</b>	100.0	102.6	-3%	0.0%
<b>Golden Valley</b>	100.0	97.2	2%	0.0%
<b>Grand Forks</b>	97.7	97.8	2%	0.0%
<b>City of Grand Forks</b>	93.4	95.4	4%	0.0%
<b>Grant</b>	101.0	100.9	-1%	0.0%
<b>Griggs</b>	98.4	96.5	3%	0.0%
<b>Hettinger</b>	100.0	100.1	-1%	0.0%
<b>Kidder</b>	95.6	96.2	3%	0.0%
<b>LaMoure</b>	101.5	101.0	-1%	0.0%
<b>Logan</b>	100.3	100.9	-1%	0.0%
<b>McHenry</b>	100.0	99.7	0%	0.0%
<b>McIntosh</b>	98.0	99.0	0%	0.0%
<b>McKenzie</b>	100.0	99.5	0%	0.0%
<b>McLean</b>	93.0	95.1	5%	0.0%

\* Adjustment worksheet ratios are the result of increases and decreases of property after changes in the county.

The State Board of Equalization allows a 5% tolerance of the median ratio after the adjustment worksheet is completed. A change is made only if the indicated change is more than plus or minus 5%.

\*Dickey County made an error in the supplementary abstract. The sales ratio statistics, after correction of the supplementary abstract, show commercial property needs a 4 percent increase. Dickey county is within the tolerance.

**Table 7 Continued**  
**2003 Median Ratios and Changes by the State Board of Equalization**

Commercial

County	Median Ratio	* Adjustment Worksheet	Indicated Change	State Board Change
<b>Mercer</b>	97.8	98.0	2%	0.0%
<b>Morton</b>	100.0	100.3	-1%	0.0%
<b>City of Mandan</b>	90.2	96.2	3%	0.0%
<b>Mounttrail</b>	100.0	100.1	-1%	0.0%
<b>Nelson</b>	95.9	96.2	3%	0.0%
<b>Oliver</b>	98.5	98.5	1%	0.0%
<b>Pembina</b>	95.7	95.0	5%	0.0%
<b>Pierce</b>	101.9	103.7	-4%	0.0%
<b>Ramsey</b>	100.0	97.2	2%	0.0%
<b>City of Devils Lake</b>	95.6	95.3	4%	0.0%
<b>Ransom</b>	99.8	98.3	1%	0.0%
<b>Renville</b>	103.4	103.4	-4%	0.0%
<b>Richland</b>	97.4	100.0	0%	0.0%
<b>City of Wahpeton</b>	100.0	100.6	-1%	0.0%
<b>Rolette</b>	101.2	97.0	3%	0.0%
<b>Sargent *</b>	106.1	*106.4	7%	0.0%
<b>Sheridan</b>	99.8	100.2	-1%	0.0%
<b>Sioux *</b>	108.4	*121.2	-18%	0.0%
<b>Slope</b>	100.0	101.6	-2%	0.0%
<b>Stark</b>	100.0	99.9	0%	0.0%
<b>City of Dickinson</b>	98.3	98.6	1%	0.0%
<b>Steele</b>	98.5	98.4	1%	0.0%
<b>Stutsman</b>	100.0	100.2	-1%	0.0%
<b>City of Jamestown</b>	96.3	96.7	3%	0.0%
<b>Towner *</b>	108.4	108.1	-8%	-5.0%
<b>Traill</b>	100.1	99.8	0%	0.0%
<b>Walsh</b>	100.0	99.6	0%	0.0%
<b>City of Grafton</b>	102.0	96.7	3%	0.0%
<b>Ward</b>	98.9	98.8	1%	0.0%
<b>City of Minot</b>	100.7	100.4	-1%	0.0%
<b>Wells</b>	100.0	99.8	0%	0.0%
<b>Williams</b>	103.3	102.7	-3%	0.0%
<b>City of Williston</b>	100.4	100.6	-1%	0.0%
<b>State</b>	100.0			

\* Sargent County inverted the sale price and true and full value columns when supplementing appraisals for the Sales Ratio Study. When that was corrected the median ratio was 97.3% and the adjustment worksheet ratio was 97%. The indicated change is 2 percent which shows Sargent County is in compliance.

\* Sioux County also inverted the two columns and had an incorrect sale price on one sale. When these corrections were made the median ratio was 92.2% and the adjustment worksheet ratio was 103.1%. The indicated change is -4 percent which shows Sioux County is in compliance.

\*The State Board voted to reduce assessments of all commercial property in Towner County 5 percent. Also, directed Towner Co. to complete a reappraisal of all commercial property for the 2004 assessment.

**Table 8**  
**Average Prices Per Acre and Median Ratios for Agricultural Land**

County	No. of Sales	Avg. Price Per Acre	Median Ratio
<b>Adams</b>	15	231	69.5
<b>Barnes</b>	24	435	80.6
<b>Benson</b>	23	310	97.7
<b>Billings</b>	9	292	57.7
<b>Bottineau</b>	23	391	64.6
<b>Bowman</b>	0	#N/A	0.0
<b>Burke</b>	17	299	77.3
<b>Burleigh</b>	14	282	59.0
<b>Cass</b>	29	771	63.4
<b>Cavalier</b>	44	569	62.5
<b>Dickey</b>	20	371	81.4
<b>Divide</b>	20	290	75.4
<b>Dunn</b>	17	272	54.2
<b>Eddy</b>	11	260	96.6
<b>Emmons</b>	40	300	66.0
<b>Foster</b>	10	364	84.1
<b>Golden Valley</b>	17	226	65.9
<b>Grand Forks</b>	21	537	102.7
<b>Grant</b>	28	210	63.8
<b>Griggs</b>	17	360	97.2
<b>Hettinger</b>	18	308	63.7
<b>Kidder</b>	13	200	101.4
<b>LaMoure</b>	15	502	77.7
<b>Logan</b>	40	241	68.5
<b>McHenry</b>	37	292	80.1
<b>McIntosh</b>	68	277	74.7
<b>McKenzie</b>	15	240	63.4
<b>McLean</b>	23	302	72.9
<b>Mercer</b>	19	230	75.7
<b>Morton</b>	31	224	66.7
<b>Mountrail</b>	13	395	52.3
<b>Nelson</b>	30	264	100.7
<b>Oliver</b>	13	284	61.3
<b>Pembina</b>	32	760	59.5
<b>Pierce</b>	35	326	81.3
<b>Ramsey</b>	26	312	87.5
<b>Ransom</b>	11	448	88.6
<b>Renville</b>	20	439	66.9
<b>Richland</b>	21	996	49.8
<b>Rolette</b>	21	245	103.8
<b>Sargent</b>	18	477	75.7
<b>Sheridan</b>	6	274	87.0
<b>Sioux</b>	2	#N/A	72.3
<b>Slope</b>	14	243	63.8
<b>Stark</b>	16	379	45.1
<b>Steele</b>	4	#N/A	97.0
<b>Stutsman</b>	30	380	69.9
<b>Towner</b>	26	271	102.0
<b>Traill</b>	37	735	68.6
<b>Walsh</b>	27	781	75.7
<b>Ward</b>	26	411	59.1
<b>Wells</b>	22	328	94.6
<b>Williams</b>	33	265	62.3
<b>State</b>	1,161	346	72.4

**Office of State Tax Commissioner  
600 E. Boulevard Ave., Dept. 127  
Bismarck, ND 58505  
(701) 328-2770**

[www.ndtaxdepartment.com](http://www.ndtaxdepartment.com)  
[taxinfo@state.nd.us](mailto:taxinfo@state.nd.us)  
[www.discovernd.com](http://www.discovernd.com)



October 2003